



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

habit of loyalty to dynastic masters in German land. Though habits so ingrained change of themselves but slowly, a government that is dependent for its popular support upon its recent social achievements may well fall when such accomplishments fail. Veblen's formula is too simple and abstract.

Veblen's book was written before the publication of the program of the English Labor party and the author was unable to comment on it. It is a program that assumes that the wealth of the community can and may be commandeered for the common good. All governments among the belligerents are acting today upon that principle. Unquestionably such a program would not have been formulated by the English Labor party at this time but for the war, but it is after all an outcome of the democratic movement in our modern industrial democracies. It is not a movement to abolish private property. It aims to proceed slowly and experimentally. It has been dependent on the development of many forces besides the growing power of organized labor. Education, sanitary science, the prevention and elimination of disease, improved housing, and other social undertakings have contributed to the formation of the present conception of what should be the standard of life, and this is responsible for the recognition that the wealth of the community can be and should be spent by the community for those community values which can be obtained in no other way. Now this movement which gives the content to the program by the English Labor party gets no recognition from Veblen, who sees only the tendency of wealth to gravitate into the hands of the few, and their tendency to spend it for purposes of conspicuous waste or, to use his other formula, "pecuniary waste and personal futility." Veblen's formulas are too simple and abstract to do justice either to social movements or to the psychology of the individual.

GEORGE H. MEAD

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Trade Unionism in the United States. By ROBERT F. HOXIE.

New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1917. \$2.50.

Professor Hoxie's critique on American trade unions appears at a time when they are more securely entrenched in American life than ever before. It is timely both because it throws light on the efforts and purposes of these organizations and because it lays the intellectual groundwork for sound programs for economic reconstruction. Inevitably as the war draws to a close, and as the forces which it is shaping

become clearer, various plans for social reorganization will spring up in America as they have in England. And they will have value only as they are animated by the sort of tough-mindedness which characterizes Professor Hoxie's thinking. To be patient in inquiry and fearless in realism was his constant effort. And in the treating of such a complex subject as trade unions this patience and fearlessness were especially needed. They have, moreover, been amply rewarded, for the present volume promises to stand for some years to come as the most penetrating and sympathetic interpretation of the labor movement.

There are four major ideas which at the same time underlie the detailed discussion of trade-union policies and constitute the vital conclusions of the study. The inwardness of the book will be most readily understood if we consider briefly these four ideas and indicate the way in which Professor Hoxie has used them.

The book gets its first claim to realistic treatment because of an insistence upon the psychological point of view. Professor Hoxie has in the second place had constantly in view the conception of "function" which De Maetz has since popularized in his *Authority, Liberty and Function*. His discussion of labor's attitude toward scientific management constitutes the third valuable feature of the book. And his reiteration that the labor problem is fundamentally a problem of control is the fourth idea.

The book includes no systematic discussion of modern psychology in its relation to the labor problem, but a service of equal value is rendered because this knowledge animates the entire thinking of the author. His specific references to psychology are few and general. For example, in discussing "the rational man" he says:

I do not intend to deny that men do weigh and balance before acting, or to maintain that they are not at all rational. What I mean to say is that they are not altogether rational, that they are moved by love and hate, fear and prejudices, habits and propensity, apart from and often in opposition to the dictates of rationality. And this is not only in line with common observation but with modern psychology, which tells us that we are bundles of propensities, preconceptions, impulses, and habits—some of them inherited from a remote past. We are guided in our action both by feeling and habit, by intellect, and perhaps more by the first than by the last.

This is as explicit as his references to the contribution of modern psychology ever become. He had not followed the train of thought which Professor Carleton H. Parker's writings have started regarding the relation of the psychology of the abnormal and of suppressed desires

to the interpretation of industrial unrest. Nor did he utilize in detail the "behavioristic" psychology which seeks to understand conduct in terms of the interaction of instinct and intelligence. But without the obtrusion of this scholarship he successfully held in view his knowledge of human nature; and he used this conception of human nature as a touchstone to which he brought institutions and movements for judgment.

The conception of functional organization is in the last analysis a simple idea. Wherever there is a function to be performed, a group of interests to be protected, an organization will in all probability be created to perform the function. The widespread recognition of a common need or of common unprotected interests means the creation of a new group. The extent of organization among manual workers stimulates Professor Hoxie's curiosity; and the main question which his book seeks to answer is: Why do trade unions exist; what functions are they expected to perform? The question is not raised in vain, for Professor Hoxie's answer is specific, practical, and complete. The book demonstrates that they do not exist by chance or because of the "cussedness" of labor agitators. They exist in the first instance for purposes of defense. The trade union is seeking to defend the human rights of the manual worker in the face of an economic evolution in which credit control is increasingly centralized and large-scale industry increasingly prevalent. Yet, as Professor Hoxie rightly points out, the function of defense, while it is obviously an immediate one, is not the basic one. The point is made that to secure defense under existing conditions the purpose must be the securing of increased control. In other words, the trade unions have a function; they are born of necessity. And their vital character is leading them on to make claims in the government of industry which exceed the mere request for "reasonable" adjustment and demand participation in control.

It is because scientific management at every point balks the fulfillment of this purpose of extended control of industry by the workers that it is so cordially condemned by organized labor. Professor Hoxie has made the point that the application of "simon-pure" scientific management results in the weakening of trade unions because it minimizes craft training and craftsmanship; it puts all matters of judgment and discretion in the hands of the management and leaves the worker a mere "hand" in a great industrial machine. Indeed the emphasis of scientific management upon output and low unit costs means, in the absence of other offsets, that all the evils of capitalist production are

being progressively accentuated. Whether the unions have recognized this consciously or not does not matter. The fact remains that scientific management applied without correctives would mean overproduction, underemployment, an oversupplied labor market with workers bidding each other down in an effort to get a day's work. And with an unerring instinct for self-preservation the unions have obstructed the application of Taylor system ideas. Its unadulterated success would leave the workers not only stripped of any share in control but unprotected as well.

The limitations of a book devoted only to understanding what *is* are well illustrated in this discussion of scientific management. The study makes no great effort to pull together its own conclusions or to draw the more obvious lessons from its own facts. "Scientific management," concludes Professor Hoxie's chapter on this subject, "properly applied, normally functioning, should it become universal would spell the doom of effective unionism as it exists today." But the obverse of this conclusion is less clear, especially in the light of the upheaval of ideas which the war is causing. It is *not* true, as things stand today, that trade unions "properly applied" and "normally functioning" would "spell the doom of effective scientific management." The pessimism of Professor Hoxie's conclusion is obviously at odds with his own dynamic conception of labor's place in the community. To be sure he is merely stating a fact in recording trade-union opposition to "efficiency systems"; but his implication is that it will be permanently impossible to reconcile labor organization with efficient operation in industry. The direction, even when he wrote these chapters, was all the other way. The play of creative intelligence in the industrial world was beginning to show methods of reconciliation. They are to be more plainly seen today. Both "effective unionism as it exists today" and "scientific management properly functioning" are in constant flux. Neither is blind to the forces at work in industry and neither is unaffected by them.

Indeed the gradual shift of emphasis in the labor world from the cry for "more, more, more" in the way of wages to demands for joint control of shop affairs and methods means that the chance for labor to control improvements in process will increase. And the control of labor over processes will, if present indications are true, mean not stagnation in operating methods but their readier acceptance, *provided that the workers secure simultaneously guaranties of regular work and adequate pay.*

The demand for control is after all the real demand of the unions. The unions are groups of manual workers, interested in a share of life

as well as of livelihood. What life means, how it is to be secured, labor does not always know. But it does know that control over the great economic forces that make and break civilizations is now in hands that are blind to human, personal considerations. The recent demands of the British Labor Party for a "new social order" were made by a body composed predominantly of trade unions, schooled in trade-union discipline, taught by trade-union experience that "wages, hours, and conditions" were poor substitutes for "a new deal all round." What the trade unions of England now want is "the democratic control of industry, the enforcement of the universal national minimum of subsistence, the social control of credit and finance, and the utilization of the industrial surplus for the workers' good." A large order, but one born of a vision of popular control in which human and personal ends are dominant and determining.

Professor Hoxie is not discussing English labor, but the developments in the English world convincingly illustrate his text. American labor is as yet less vocal in its demands than its British colleagues; but, as the author says, its claim for increased control already "interferes vitally with current distributive methods and results; it combats at every point the employers' claims of rights in the management of industry; it conflicts with the legal theory upon which our social and industrial system is based and with the established law and order; in many ways it opposes our conventional ethical standards and notions of right and justice."

In the period of American reconstruction these claims for a thoroughgoing modification of existing legal, business, and ethical standards promise to be pressed with maximum vigor. Whether or not they will be urged in a spirit of tolerance or in a passion of revolt remains, as Professor Hoxie intimates, for the "third party" to decide. For he is convinced that the existence of a "public" with a "public opinion" is a reality—a reality that can have determining weight in industrial affairs. Being a realist, the author has not conceived of America as arrayed "capital" against "labor." He sees rather varied opposing interests aligning and realigning as interests and functions change. But in any one controversy, even though it be on a large scale, there are "the people . . . a party already capable in ordinary cases of acting as mediator and arbiter between the warring classes."

Professor Hoxie goes farther than this, however, if I understand him aright. He appears to look with favor upon the rather unrealistic idea that "with the growth of knowledge of social affairs and the increase of social interaction fostered by democracy, this third party will gradually

control the warring classes and ultimately absorb them. The social will will then be supreme, and social harmony will prevail. The attainment of this end involves a constant extension of social control in the form of legislation and public opinion in the support of the weaker warring class—the workers.” Nevertheless he goes on to add that “while in matters in which the interests of the warring classes are really opposed there appears to be no possibility of a third party altogether without any economic class interest and bias, or of setting up general and absolute or exact standards of social right or justice to which all or a majority can be depended upon to adhere, there *is* a possibility of discovering in connection with every such specific problem *minima* and *maxima* which represent a nearer approach than at present exists to social right and justice.”

And he concludes the book sturdily enough with a strong, ringing plea for the development of “social standards, of a constructive program, and of the machinery to put it into force.” Pointing out that the “so-called public has no machinery of action, or constructive program, and no means of getting into the game before the struggle is on,” he valiantly cries out for a “means of informing the public beforehand” in order “to make action a school for the development of social understanding and constructive ends.”

ORDWAY TEAD

WASHINGTON, D.C.